DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 235

CG 002 790

By-Shaw, Merville C.; Rector, William H.

GROUP COUNSELING WITH PARENTS: FEASIBILITY, REACTIONS AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS. MONOGRAPH NUMBER 5.

Chico State Coll., Calif. Western Regional Center of the Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services, IRCOPPS.

Pub Date May 68

Note-97p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.96

Descriptors-*COUNSELING EFFECTIVENESS, *GROUP COUNSELING, GUIDANCE COUNSELING, *PARENT ATTITUDES, *PARENT COUNSELING, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *RESEARCH

This monograph reports upon data collected and analyzed in connection with a research project testing the feasibility of group counseling with parents. The group counseling was a part of the school guidance services. Data were collected in six school districts and based upon the experiences of 38 counselors and 53 parent counseling groups. An analysis of the parent post-series reaction sheet showed a highly positive attitude in parents participating in group counseling. This attitude was strengthened after a second year of counseling in the same district. An analysis of the written "counselor reactions to specific groups" (CRSG) showed that counselor responses became more positive the longer parents remained in their respective groups. The correlations between parent and counselor responses suggest that parents' enjoyment of the group experience and the benefits they gain from it may not necessarily be related. Attendance patterns were also analyzed. (PS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDANCE
RESEARCH
PROJECT

ED022235

Group Counseling with Parents: Feasibility, Reactions and Interrelationships

Monograph #5

Merville C. Shaw and William H. Rector

WESTERN REGIONAL CENTER
OF THE INTERPROFESSIONAL RESEARCH
COMMISSION ON PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

CHICO STATE COLLEGE
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

ED022235

CG 002 790

Group Counseling with Parents: Feasibility, Reactions and Interrelationships

Merville C. Shaw, Director

and

William H. Rector, Associate Director

Western Regional Center of
the Interprofessional Research Commission on
Pupil Personnel Services

Chico State College
Chico, California

May, 1968

Preface and Acknowledgements

In a previous monograph (Shaw and Rector, 1966) the subjective reactions of counselors and parents to their mutual experiences in a series of parent group counseling sessions were reported. This monograph continues and extends those findings by reporting on parent and counselor responses following a second year of such an endeavor. In addition to duplicating the data reported in the first monograph, this monograph will extend the original data by reporting on interrelationships between parent and counselor responses and by studying the relationship of parent attendance at the groups to other variables.

The school districts, schools and counselors participating in the second year of parent groups counseling are, in large measure, identical to those who participated in the first year of the parent group counseling project. In passing, it should be noted that the term "counselor" is utilized within this monograph in a very broad sense. Those who served as group counselors actually represented a wide spectrum of the pupil personnel professions, including counseling, school psychology, school social work, nursing and speech therapy.

All participating districts, schools and group counselors were self selected. A high degree of professional commitment and personal courage were necessary for participation in this project. This can be attested to by the fact that it was necessary to explore, in depth, in 22 different school districts before the cooperation of the six districts which participated in the study was obtained. The reasons for non-participation were many and undoubtedly a number were sound. On the other hand, it was quite clear that participation in something as revolutionary as broad scale and formalized parent group counseling was a frightening idea to administrators. The courage of those who elected to participate cannot be overestimated.

While there was less reluctance on the part of pupil personnel specialists, it was nevertheless obvious to the authors that a high degree of self selection took place with respect to participating counselors. As a matter of fact, our conclusion was that self selection was the most important single variable which operated to provide the project with such a highly competent and dedicated group of professionals. The criteria initially set up by the project with respect to required background of experience and training proved unnecessary after self selection had taken place. A previous monograph (Shaw and Tuel, 1965) describes the training, experience and professional background of participating counselors during the first year of the project. Those who participated during the second year were essentially similar. What no objective data can describe is the enthusiasm and commitment of participating counselors, nor is it possible to describe the deep appreciation and respect which the staff of the Western Regional Center have for these professionals.

Several people deserve special mention for the part they played in assisting with the project. Dr. Clarence Mahler provided invaluable assistance in the preparation of participating counselors to do group work. This assistance was provided during strenuous and stimulating workshops held in the Southern California and Albuquerque areas prior to the initiation of a second year of parent group counseling. Mrs. Eunice Toussaint has been called upon to exercise her strengths for

organization, patience and understanding to a considerable degree in the preparation of manuscripts and tables. All members of the staff of the Western Regional Center have been involved in some way with this study. Without their intelligence, loyalty and skill, the preparation of this report would not have been possible.

PARENT GROUP COUNSELORS

Albuquerque

Helen Andrews
Elizabeth Bounds
Evelyn Curb
Helen Dean
Lucy Dobkins
Geraldine Drake
Wynn Grisham
Betty Harrison
Bettie Jones
Jack Kaemper
Dale Kerby
Camille McRae
Joyce Moeller
Agnes Moloney
Julianne Papcsy
Grace Richardson
Paul Rost
Edward Saiers
Anthony Sanchez
Frances Tuthill
Ray Veseth

Alvord

Joseph Didier
Robert Duff
Fred Heslett
Jack Kaeppel
Loring Snook

Azusa

Willis Kleinsasser
Donald Welch

North District

Jack Gold

Palm Springs

Clara Alcorn
Greta Baldwin

Valley East

Andrew Adams
Sylvia Ehrlich
Fay Grassi
Enid Lilley
Meyer Marx

Valley West

Katsumi Arimoto
Irwin Sobel

STAFF
WESTERN REGIONAL CENTER
Spring 1968

Terry Benn

Meredith Bradley

Bernadette Chavez

Robert Crocker

JoAnne Eckhardt

Deborah Fuller

Margo Kennedy

Paul Molino

Sylvia Myers

Betty Pires

Alma Price

Eunice Toussaint

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. Setting the Stage 1

    Procedures 2

2. Results Obtained from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet 7

    Parent Responses by Series 7
    Results by Series and by Academic Level 9
    PSRS Results by Series and District 11
    Comparison of Current with Previous Data 14
    Summary 15
    Tables 2-A through 2-O 16-27

3. Counselor Reactions to Their Group Experience 29

    Outcomes by District 32
    Differences among Academic Levels 35
    Tables 3-A through 3-M 38-47

4. Interrelationships between Parent and Counselor Responses 49

    Correlations between Group Means of Parent and Counselor Responses 50
    Correlations between Individual Means of Parent and Counselor Responses: Series 1 52
    Correlation between Counselor and Parent Perceptions by Individuals: Series 2 54
    Tables 4-A through 4-H 56-59

5. Parent Attendance Patterns 61

    Interrelationships between Parent Attendance and Subjective Parent Reactions to Group Participation 62
    Correlations between Group Attendance and Post-Series Reactions Sheets 65
    Relationships between Parent Attendance Patterns and Counselor Perceptions 67
    Tables 5-A through 5-K 70-78

6. Summary 79

    Parent Responses 79
    Counselor Responses 80
    Correlations between Parent and Counselor Responses 82
    Attendance Variables 83

References 86

Appendices

A. Post-Series Reaction Sheet (Parent)
B. Counselor Reactions to Specific Group
C. General Counselor Reactions

Chapter 1

Setting the Stage

The basic purpose of this monograph is to report a variety of kinds of data collected and analyzed in connection with a research project which attempted to test the feasibility of a specific model for the provision of guidance services in the public schools. Two points need to be emphasized. The first is that research on group counseling with parents was not undertaken with the idea that this technique had any special merit in and of itself. Group counseling, or any other technique used by any guidance specialist, has merit only insofar as it has relevance to a specified set of objectives which have been previously established for the total guidance program. The haphazard utilization of a variety of techniques and the provision of a smorgasbord of services without reference to predetermined objectives have contributed to the serious difficulty which guidance specialists in general have experienced in demonstrating the effectiveness of their efforts.

A second point which needs to be kept in mind is that the research effort reported here represents only a partial implementation of a total model. Parent group counseling is not seen as the only way, nor even the best way, to modify the learning environment, but rather as one of a variety of ways which may be effective in accomplishing this end. The validity of a guidance model which takes as its major objective modification of the learning environment in order to make learning more possible and useful to the student does not necessarily stand or fall on the results to be reported here. This technique represents but one of many which the guidance specialist may elect to utilize in the implementation of such a goal.

A previous monograph (Shaw and Rector, 1966) reported on parent and counselor reactions to their group counseling experiences during the first year of our research efforts in this area. The present monograph will report upon similar data for the second year of research operation and, in addition, will examine more complex interactions among parent and counselor responses to their mutual experience. The data contained in the present report will also be compared with identical data from the previous report on parent and counselor reactions to participation in group counseling. Future data analysis will permit examination of the impact of parent group counseling on children, but this topic is not covered in the present report.

Procedures

Both the rationale and procedures utilized in this study have been reported in detail elsewhere (Shaw and Tuel, 1964; Shaw and Tuel, 1965). Briefly, the data reported here were collected in six different school districts and are based upon the experiences of 38 counselors who conducted a total of 53 parent counseling groups among them. The term "counselor," as used in this report, designates an individual who acted as a group leader. In actuality, the counselor group represented a variety of the various pupil personnel subspecialties, including counselors, school psychologists, school psychometrists, school social workers, school nurses and others. The group ranged in experience from those who had had little or no group counseling background to those who had extensive group counseling background and had been previously involved in the project. The group tended to be younger, and the median number of years of experience as a pupil personnel specialist was five.

The parent population included the parents of first, seventh and ninth grade children. This limitation was imposed due to the fact that there were not enough group counselors available to provide blanket coverage to the parents of an entire school. The first, seventh and ninth grades were chosen on a logical rather than empirical basis, because they represent articulation points at which the child begins a new phase of his academic career. Among the six districts which were involved in the study, there were a total of 23 elementary schools, three junior high schools and two high schools.

All the parents of children in the first, seventh or ninth grades of cooperating schools were invited to participate in a series of small parent discussion groups. At the elementary and junior high school level, parents were informed that the focus of the groups would be on the kinds of concerns that parents normally have about their growing children and about the educational development of their children. At the ninth grade level, the focus was more specifically on the parental role in educational and vocational decision making.

At the two lower academic levels, parents were invited to an initial series of five sessions, the first of which was used in obtaining pre-counseling data from parents. At the end of the first five sessions, parents were informed that those who were interested might continue for a second series of four sessions, and the same procedure was followed at the end of the second series. At the secondary level, parents were initially invited for a series of seven sessions, followed by the opportunity to participate in a second series of five sessions. Thus, any parent of a first or seventh grader in a participating school might elect not to participate in parent discussion groups or to participate in five, eight or twelve group counseling sessions. At the high school level, a parent might decide not to participate at all or to participate in seven or twelve group meetings.

At the time parents were invited, every effort was made to make it clear that they were not being invited to attend a series of lectures, but rather to participate in a discussion with other parents about their concerns with the development or education of their own children. This effort was not always successful, and the expectations of parents were not always met when they found that the group leader was acting as a counselor and not as a lecturer. A few parents elected to drop out upon making this discovery, but most remained to participate.

Most participating counselors had had extensive prior training in their respective professional fields and, in addition, had been given special training in group techniques by members of the project staff and consultants. They were carefully instructed to bend their efforts in the direction of structuring a group situation which would provide maximum opportunity for free interchange among group members. Every effort was made to bring about conditions which would maximize parental participation and which would encourage them to discuss their own interests and concerns with regard to their own children. If parents brought up matters of school policy or raised criticisms of specific school personnel, it was the consultant's role to point out that although these might be matters of pressing concern to the parents, the focus of these particular groups was their children and the things which they as parents could do directly to assist their children.

The problem of controls was thoroughly considered prior to initiation of the project. While it is considered respectable to apply certain kinds of controls, those who usually discuss their utilization tend to be methodologists who are not faced with the kinds of problems presented by the ongoing school situation. In the present study, all participating counselors were exposed to the same pre-experimental training procedures. Invitations to parents were all issued in the same way. All parents in any particular group had children in one specific school grade. Opportunity was provided to parents to participate in identical numbers of counseling sessions, and identical evaluations were presented to parents and to counselors in the same way and at the same period of time. Other kinds of controls were utilized with respect to other aspects of the project, but are not relevant to the present data. Certain controls normally considered to be ideal could not be utilized for practical reasons. For example, it was not possible to randomly assign parents to counseled or uncounseled groups. Most of the school systems which participated would not permit this kind of "discrimination."

At the completion of each series of group counseling sessions, each participating parent who was present was asked to fill out a Post-Series Reaction Sheet. Forms were mailed to those parents who were not present. The Post-Series Reaction Sheet contained items which could be answered both objectively and subjectively. A copy of the form appears in Appendix A. Data on counselor reactions were collected at two points. It was collected first at the time that each counselor finished a group series. At that time, a form called Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups was completed. A copy of this form appears in Appendix B. The second kind of counselor data collected was that appearing on the form entitled General Counselor Reactions. This data was collected following the completion of all parent groups for the year. A copy of this form appears in Appendix C.

Raw data will be reported for each of the questionnaires by academic level, district and series. In addition, comparisons will be made between responses obtained on second-year participant counselors and parents and first-year participant counselors and parents. The interrelationships between certain parent and counselor responses also are of interest, and correlations will be reported between parent and counselor responses. This will be done in two ways. First, the group mean of parent responses will be correlated with the response of the counselor of that group. Second, the individual responses of parents in the group will be correlated with the counselor response. In the former case, N will equal the total number of groups being reported, while in the latter case, N will equal the total number of parents responding to the instruments utilized. Data breakdowns by school level (Grades 1, 7 or 9) and by counseling series (1, 2 or 3) will be reported when appropriate.

Chapter 2

Results Obtained from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet

A copy of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet is contained in Appendix A. Only those items are reported which were answered objectively. This includes Items 1, 2, 3, 3a and 4. Results are reported by series, since it might logically be assumed that the further in a series parents progressed, the more positive their responses might be. Each table also reports the number of respondents to each item. In addition, responses are further reported in terms of the academic level of the individual reporting and by school district. It should be noted that although tables indicate six districts are reporting, two of these districts (Districts E and F) are sub-districts within a large metropolitan school district.

Parent Responses by Series

Tables 2-A through 2-E report the responses of parents to the five objective items of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet by series alone, with all districts and grade levels lumped together. Table 2-A indicates that a high proportion of parents responded that the group discussions had been helpful to them. (Throughout this monograph, categories 4 and 5 will be considered indicative of a positive response, while categories 1 and 2 will be considered indicative of a negative response. Category 3 will be considered to be an ambivalent or neutral response.) This proportion approaches 50% in Series 1, increases to 71% for Series 2 and increases still further to 85% for Series 3. These findings are in line with expectations. It should not be forgotten that over 27% of parents who participated in Series 1 responded that the groups had not been helpful. These parents are probably among those who dropped out for Series 2, since the not helpful response falls to approximately 3% for Series 2. It is interesting to note that the not helpful response increased to 6% for the third series of parent discussions.

Table 2-B indicates that almost no parents who participated in the group counseling perceived any negative outcomes as a result of such participation. As was true of the preceding item, favorable responses increased as parents remained longer in group counseling.

Table 2-C indicates the proportion of parents who were willing to say that observable behavior changes, presumably associated with parent participation in group counseling, had come about. It is interesting to note that this increases from 9% to 15% from Series 1 to Series 2, but that it falls off slightly in Series 3. This outcome, and possibly the relative increase in the not helpful responses seen in Series 3 of Table 2-A, may possibly be accounted for by the fact that parents who stay in group counseling the longest time have the children with the most serious problems.

Results reported in Table 2-D indicate that perceived behavior changes are seen as positive rather than negative. These results again lend some support to the hypothesis that parents who remain the longest in group counseling may have children with more serious problems than those who stay for only one or two series.

A different kind of criterion is applied through the use of Question 5, which asks if participants in parent group counseling would recommend such participation to their friends whose children may have academic difficulties. The question is unfortunately worded, and hindsight indicates that the phrase "who have children with academic problems" should have been left off. In any event, nearly all of those who participated indicated that they would recommend such participation. The proportion is higher for Series 2 and 3 than for Series 1, when the greatest dropout took place.

Results by Series and by Academic Level

Tables 2-F through 2-J report parent responses to the items on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet by both series and grade level. Table 2-F reports on Question 1, "Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?" If responses 4 and 5 are again considered "favorable" and responses 1 and 2 are considered "unfavorable," it is obvious that parent groups at the junior high school level were perceived less favorably than those at either the elementary or senior high level. It should be emphasized that the N at the senior high level is small in both Series 1 and 2 and that there was no Series 3 at the high school level.

A majority of the parents felt that group discussions had been helpful at all grade levels and in all three series, with the exception of Grade 7 following Series 1 and Grade 9 following Series 2. With the latter exception, the favorableness of parent responses increased at all grade levels during Series 2 and Series 3. It is generally true that the longer a parent remains in group counseling, the more favorable his responses become. Negative responses decline markedly, almost disappearing at the elementary level during the second series. A few negative responses do reappear at the Grade 1 level at the end of

Series 3. This again supports the notion that parents whose children have more serious problems may remain in the groups longer.

Table 2-G reports on parent responses to a question about negative outcomes from participation in group discussions. This table bears little comment, since the overwhelming proportion of parents indicated the absence of any negative perceptions about the group discussions. By the time Series 3 has been completed, perception of negative results has dropped to zero.

Parent perceptions of changed child behavior are reflected in Table 2-H. The parents of first and seventh graders report such changes, while parents of high school students do not. They are reported most frequently by parents of Grade 1 students. The relative proportion of such reports increases from the first to the second series in both the elementary and junior high grades. In fact, nearly one out of every five parents responding report changes in the behavior of their first grade children at the end of the second series. This proportion increases again for the parents of first graders during the third series, but falls to zero for the parents of seventh graders after the third series. It is also interesting to note the remarkable consistency among the small group of high school parents who report that there were no changed behaviors after either the first or second series.

Table 2-I indicates that the overwhelming proportion of changes perceived by parents were in a positive rather than a negative direction, while Table 2-J reveals that parents who participated in group counseling indicate in very high proportions that they would recommend similar participation to friends who have children with academic problems.

The proportion of positive response increases uniformly among all three grade levels as parents remain longer in the counseling groups.

PSRS Results by Series and District

Tables 2-K through 2-O report parent responses by both series and district. It will be obvious that District D barely got its program off the ground and, for all practical purposes, can be ignored in these tables. It should also be reiterated that Districts E and F are in reality sub-districts within a single large school district. Responses reflected under the heading "District A" are preponderantly those of the parents of junior high school students. Responses from parents in other districts are preponderantly from those who have children in the first grade.

Table 2-K reports on Question 1 from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet (PSRS), "Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?" The smallest proportions of positive response were found in Districts A and F for Series 1, but for Series 2 the smallest proportion of positive response was found in District B, which dropped from a 55% positive response during Series 1 to a 52% positive response during Series 2. All other districts, including A and F, increased markedly in proportion of positive response. This table also revealed that only three districts were able to carry out a third series of parent group discussions. In these three districts, the proportion of positive response seen after Series 2 was either maintained, as in the case of District B, or increased, as in the case of Districts A and E. The existence of marked differences on this variable from one district to another suggests two possibilities. The most obvious one perhaps is that those who conducted the group sessions in different districts were differentiable on the basis of their group counseling abilities. Data exists which permit an examination of this question, and future publications will report on this issue. The second possibility is that parents of first graders may respond differently to this kind of experience than the parents of seventh graders. This kind of difference appears to exist following Series 1, but is less marked after Series 2.

Table 2-L reflects a relatively low proportion of negative response on the part of parents. The absolute number of parents who indicate negative responses following any of the three series is so small in a given district that further comment on this table relative to differentiation among districts on this variable is not warranted.

Table 2-M reports on whether or not parents perceive behavior changes to occur in their children in conjunction with the group counseling sessions. The highest proportion of such behavior changes are reported from District C and District E. All districts reporting after Series 2 indicate relative increases in the number of positive responses, except District B which remains essentially unchanged. This is consistent with responses to Question 1 following Series 2 (see Table 2-K). This is not the case, however, following Series 3, except in District E, which does report a marked increase in positive responses. It appears that District E counselors are either serving a different kind of clientele or performed differently than counselors in other districts, since positiveness of parent reaction is more marked in this district than in any other.

Table 2-N indicates that parents from Districts A, E and F did perceive some negative changes following Series 1, but no negative responses were found in any of these three districts following Series 2. A single negative response did show up in District E following Series 3.

Table 2-O indicates that parents in all districts were willing to recommend participation in such groups to their friends. There was more of a reluctance among parents who participated in group counseling in District A to recommend parent group counseling to their friends than was found in any other district. This held true after all three series. It should again be emphasized that the preponderance of responses in District A came from junior high school parents.

Some of the obvious factors related to differences among districts have already been mentioned, including the possibility that there were either differences in professional competence or differences in parent response set from one district to another. An additional and much less obvious factor has begun to appear, however. This relates to the differences which have been shown consistently to exist between responses to Series 1 and 2 and those obtained from parents who stay for a third series. Typically, positiveness of response on all five items increases from Series 1 to Series 2. From Series 2 to Series 3, however, while positiveness of response sometimes increases, it also sometimes is markedly reduced. This phenomenon is somewhat difficult to account for unless the assumption can be made that parents who remain throughout three full series tend to be parents whose children have the greatest problems. If this is the case (and future data analysis will reveal whether or not it is), then it might well be that they stand to profit the least from parent groups discussions, since the problems they bring for consideration are of such a serious nature. At the moment this must be treated as a hypothesis, but if it is eventually demonstrated to be true, then the need for alterations in procedure to provide assistance to these parents is obvious.

Comparison of Current with Previous Data

Some comparisons of current with previous data may prove interesting. The previous data were reported in a monograph by Shaw and Rector (1966). The total number of responses reported in current data is approximately the same as reported in the previous data for all three series. Responses to the question relative to the helpfulness of group discussions are generally more positive in second-year data than first-year data, while responses relative to negative results eventuating from parent participation remain approximately the same. There does appear to be a slight drop from the first to the second year in positiveness of response to the question on changes in child behavior, with a lower proportion of parents responding positively after all three series in the second year than in the first year. This difference is quite small following Series 1 and 2, but is marked following Series 3. It should be pointed out, however, that the proportion of parents who indicated that such behavior was worse, rather than better, was much higher following Series 2 during the first year than after the same series in the second year. The proportion of parents reporting better-worse behavior following Series 1 and 3 was approximately the same in both years. The proportion of parents who would recommend participation in such a group to their friends did not change markedly from the first to the second year.

Summary

The findings reported here reflect, in general, a highly positive attitude on the part of the parents who participated in group counseling. This positive attitude tends to become stronger in a second year of parent group counseling in the same school district. The strength of this positive reaction is such that it is difficult to attribute it to halo effect. Some differences among districts and among grade levels suggest that either there are differences attributable to differential levels of professional competence, or to differential reactions obtained from the parents of first graders as opposed to the parents of junior high school students. Future analysis of available data will, in part, resolve these questions.

TABLE 2-A

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series

Question No. 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Series	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1	327		6.1	21.1	23.5	24.2	25.1	
2	93		2.2	1.1	25.8	35.5	35.5	
3	33		.0	6.1	9.1	27.3	57.6	

TABLE 2-B

Question No. 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in group discussions?

Series	N	Very much so	1	2	3	4	5	Not at all
1	327		.3	1.5	4.9	10.4	82.9	
2	92		1.1	.0	5.4	8.7	84.8	
3	32		.0	.0	3.1	6.3	90.6	

TABLE 2-C

Question No. 3: Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

Series	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1	324		51.5	24.1	15.4	6.5	2.5	
2	90		43.3	24.4	16.7	11.1	4.4	
3	31		32.3	32.3	22.6	9.7	3.2	

TABLE 2-D

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series

Question No. 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the better or worse?

Series	N	Better	Worse
1	78	87.2	11.5
2	25	96.0	4.0
3	11	90.0	10.0

TABLE 2-E

Question No. 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems?

Series	N	Yes	No
1	324	91.7	8.0
2	93	97.8	2.2
3	33	97.0	3.0

TABLE 2-F

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and Grade Level

Question No. 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Grade	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
			Series 1					
1	182		3.8	17.0	24.2	24.7	30.2	
7	125		9.6	27.2	23.2	23.2	16.8	
9	20		5.0	20.0	20.0	25.0	30.0	
			Series 2					
1	61		.0	1.6	14.8	37.7	45.9	
7	26		7.7	.0	42.3	34.6	15.4	
9	6		.0	.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	
			Series 3					
1	14		.0	7.1	7.1	14.3	71.4	
7	19		.0	5.3	10.5	36.8	47.4	
9	0		(No Series 3)					

TABLE 2-G

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and Grade Level

Question No. 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Grade	N	Very much so	1	2	3	4	5	Not at all
			Series 1					
1	182		.0	1.1	3.8	9.9	85.2	
7	125		.8	2.4	6.4	12.0	78.4	
9	20		.0	.0	5.0	5.0	90.0	
			Series 2					
1	60		1.7	.0	6.7	6.7	85.0	
7	26		.0	.0	3.8	15.4	80.8	
9	6		.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	
			Series 3					
1	14		.0	.0	7.1	7.1	85.7	
7	18		.0	.0	.0	5.6	94.4	
9	0				(No Series 3)			

TABLE 2-H

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and Grade Level

Question No. 3: Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

Grade	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
			Series 1					
1	183		36.6	30.6	21.3	8.2	3.3	
7	122		71.3	13.9	8.2	4.9	1.6	
9	19		68.4	26.3	5.3	.0	.0	
			Series 2					
1	59		32.2	32.2	16.9	15.3	3.4	
7	26		65.4	3.8	19.2	3.8	7.7	
9	5		60.0	40.0	.0	.0	.0	
			Series 3					
1	14		42.9	14.3	14.3	21.4	7.1	
7	17		23.5	47.1	29.4	.0	.0	
9	0		(No Series 3)					

TABLE 2-I

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and Grade Level

Question No. 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for better or worse?

Grade	N	Better	Worse
Series 1			
1	58	87.9	10.3
7	19	84.2	15.8
9	1	100.0	.0
Series 2			
1	18	94.4	5.6
7	7	100.0	.0
9	5	60.0	40.0
Series 3			
1	5	80.0	20.0
7	6	100.0	.0
9	0	(No Series 3)	

TABLE 2-J

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and Grade Level

Question No. 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems?

Grade	N	Yes	No
		Series 1	
1	181	95.0	4.4
7	123	87.0	13.0
9	20	90.0	10.0
		Series 2	
1	61	100.0	.0
7	26	92.3	7.7
9	6	100.0	.0
		Series 3	
1	14	100.0	.0
7	19	94.7	5.3
9	0	(No Series 3)	

TABLE 2-K

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and District

Questions No. 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

District	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
			Series 1					
A	147		10.9	25.9	25.2	22.4	15.6	
B	38		7.9	15.8	21.1	26.3	28.9	
C	13		.0	7.7	23.1	7.7	61.5	
D	4		.0	.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	
E	88		1.1	15.9	21.6	27.3	34.1	
F	32		.0	31.3	28.1	25.0	15.6	
			Series 2					
A	29		6.9	.0	37.9	34.5	20.7	
B	21		.0	.0	47.6	19.0	33.3	
C	8		.0	.0	12.5	.0	87.5	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	28		.0	3.6	7.1	57.1	32.1	
F	7		.0	.0	.0	42.9	57.1	
			Series 3					
A	19		.0	5.3	10.5	36.8	47.4	
B	4		.0	25.0	25.0	.0	50.0	
C	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	10		.0	.0	.0	20.0	80.0	
F	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	

TABLE 2-L

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and District

Question No. 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

District	N	Very much so	1	2	3	4	5	Not at all ~~Very much so~~
			Series 1					
A	148		.7	2.0	6.8	10.8	79.7	
B	38		.0	.0	5.3	10.5	84.2	
C	14		.0	7.1	.0	7.1	85.7	
D	4		.0	.0	.0	25.0	75.0	
E	86		.0	1.2	4.7	8.1	86.0	
F	32		.0	.0	.0	15.6	84.4	
			Series 2					
A	29		.0	.0	3.4	17.2	79.3	
B	20		.0	.0	5.0	.0	95.0	
C	8		.0	.0	12.5	.0	87.5	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	28		3.6	.0	7.1	10.7	78.6	
F	7		.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	
			Series 3					
A	18		.0	.0	.0	5.6	94.4	
B	4		.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	
C	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	10		.0	.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	
F	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	

TABLE 2-M

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and District

Question No. 3: Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

District	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
			Series 1					
A	145		67.6	15.9	11.0	4.1	1.4	
B	37		62.2	29.7	2.7	5.4	.0	
C	14		50.0	21.4	7.1	7.1	14.3	
D	4		.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	.0	
E	87		27.6	35.6	23.0	11.5	2.3	
F	32		43.8	25.0	28.1	3.1	.0	
			Series 2					
A	29		65.5	6.9	17.2	3.4	6.9	
B	20		60.0	35.0	.0	5.0	.0	
C	7		28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	28		14.3	35.7	28.6	17.9	3.6	
F	6		33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	.0	
			Series 3					
A	17		23.5	47.1	29.4	.0	.0	
B	4		50.0	25.0	25.0	.0	.0	
C	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
D	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
E	10		40.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	
F	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	

TABLE 2-N

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and District

Question No. 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for better or worse?

Series 1

District	N	Better	Worse
A	22	86.4	13.6
B	1	100.0	.0
C	5	100.0	.0
D	1	100.0	.0
E	34	85.3	11.8
F	10	80.0	20.0

Series 2

District	N	Better	Worse
A	7	100.0	.0
B	1	100.0	.0
C	4	75.0	25.0
D	0	.0	.0
E	11	100.0	.0
F	2	100.0	.0

Series 3

District	N	Better	Worse
A	6	100.0	.0
B	1	100.0	.0
C	0	.0	.0
D	0	.0	.0
E	4	75.0	25.0
F	0	.0	.0

TABLE 2-0

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Responses by Series and District

Question No. 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems?

Series 1

District	N	Yes	No
A	146	86.3	13.7
B	37	94.6	5.4
C	14	100.0	.0
D	4	100.0	.0
E	86	96.5	3.3
F	32	93.8	6.3
Series 2			
A	29	93.1	6.9
B	21	100.0	.0
C	8	100.0	.0
D	0	.0	.0
E	28	100.0	.0
F	7	100.0	.0
Series 3			
A	19	94.7	5.3
B	4	100.0	.0
C	0	.0	.0
D	0	.0	.0
E	10	100.0	.0
F	0	.0	.0

Chapter 3

Counselor Reactions to Their Group Experience

This chapter will report the responses of counselors to the form entitled "Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups" (CRSG) (see Appendix B). This form was completed by counselors at the termination of each series for every group. For this reason, outcomes will be reported not only in terms of totals, but will be further broken down by series. In addition, because certain differences were expected among the three academic levels represented in the study, results are reported also by grade level (elementary, junior high school, high school).

Table 3-A reports counselor responses by series. A number of groups being reported for each series is also indicated in the table. The reader who wishes to study the table in detail will need to refer to Appendix B to examine the questions which each item number reflects. The table is arranged in such a way that shifts in counselor response from the first through the third series are readily discernible.

Generally speaking, counselor responses became more positive the longer parents remained in the counseling groups. This is clearly true for responses to Item Nos. 1, 2, 5 and 6. To a lesser extent it is also true of Item 3, while it is not possible to classify Item 4 with respect to its relative positiveness or negativeness.

For purposes of discussing specific items, the two most positive alternatives will be lumped together and referred to as positive responses, while the two most negative items will also be lumped together and referred to as negative responses. The middle choice will be considered as a noncommittal or ambivalent response. Responses to Item 1, which reports counselor perceptions of rapport in the group, reveal that even in Series 1 a substantial majority of counselors report positively. This percentage goes up considerably in Series 2, and by the time Series 3 has been reached, there are no negative or ambivalent responses at all.

Question 2 reports on counselor perceptions of the amount of interaction among group members. Precisely the same relationship holds from Series 1 through Series 3 on this item, as was true of Item 1. Positive responses go up uniformly from Series 1 through Series 3, and in Series 3 there are neither negative nor ambivalent responses.

Responses to Item 3 relative to the amount of hostility expressed by the group are by no means as clear-cut as responses to the first two items. Counselor responses to this item indicate that counselors perceive the degree of expressed hostility to actually increase from Series 1 to Series 2. The increase is not great. In general, it moves from a lesser amount to a central position (fair amount). There is a decrease in the amount of perceived hostility from Series 2 to Series 3, but the N dealt with in Series 3 is so small as to cast doubts on the reliability of this statistic.

During Series 1 counselors report that parent hostility was primarily directed towards teachers, and secondarily toward other group members. This pattern changes markedly for Series 2. During the second series, counselors report a gross reduction in the amount of hostility expressed toward teachers and a marked increase in that which was expressed toward their own child. In addition, there is a reported increase in the amount of hostility directed toward the counselor himself. Counselor perceptions of hostility during the third series indicate that it was primarily directed toward teachers and other group members, but again it should be emphasized that the N for Series 3 is so small as to cast doubt on the reliability of these findings.

It is interesting to speculate on the shift in hostility which occurred. It seems reasonable to assume that the easiest targets for parental blame with respect to child problems will be someone outside the family circle. Thus, the teacher is a natural target and during the first series receives the brunt of parental criticism. As counseling progresses, however, and parents look deeper into issues which concern the behavior of their children, they look somewhat closer to home and the child himself becomes the next target of parental criticism. It is interesting to speculate on whether or not the trend would continue, so that parental faultfinding might eventually be turned toward themselves if counseling were carried out long enough with a large enough number of groups.

Responses to Item 5 indicate a clear relationship between counselor perceptions of the extent to which group members insisted on a lecture approach and the amount of time which parents remained in counseling. By the time Series 2 is reached, there are no negative response to this item, and during Series 3 there are neither negative nor ambivalent responses to it. In this sense, it copies precisely the pattern of Items 1 and 2.

Item No. 6 deals with counselor perceptions of group outcomes. These responses appear to be quite frank in that during Series 1 a substantial number (almost 25%) report negative outcomes. This situation changes radically during Series 2, however, with no counselors reporting negative outcomes and about one-fourth reporting fair outcomes. The outcomes of Series 3 counseling groups are uniformly reported to be excellent.

Outcomes by District

In the belief that there might conceivably be differences in counselor competency from one district to another, results obtained on Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups were analyzed by both district and series. These outcomes are summarized in Tables 3-B through 3-G. Results for Series 3 are not reported, since only four groups went through a full three series and thus made an analysis of data by district inappropriate for this series. It should be noted that results from Districts E and F have been lumped together on the basis of the fact that they actually represent sub-districts of the same parent school district.

There do appear to be some differences among districts in response to Item 1. As might be expected, the range of responses is considerably greater in District A, which had the most responses. More significant is the fact that there is an essential similarity of response among three of the four groups reporting. The main difference is found in District D, which had a considerably smaller proportion of positive responses to this item. It should be noted in this connection, however, that District D included exclusively high school parents, and the difference here may reflect more a difference in level than in counselor perceptions or counselor competence. There were considerably higher proportions of negative responses among District A respondents and District E-F respondents. At the same time, the proportion of positive responses in these two districts was similar to that found for District B.

During Series 2, there is a pronounced shift in the positive direction among all four of the district groups. This shift is less noticeable in District E-F, however, than in the other three districts, since 25% of the responses in this district remained in the "fair" category, while no other districts report perceptions of this nature. These data indicate a striking similarity of response among the four districts.

Counselor perceptions of interaction among group members from one district to another differ very little in Series 1. The most striking thing about Table 3-C, which reports this variable, is the essential similarity among districts, rather than any differences. The same thing tends to be true of Series 2, with some slight tendency for Districts A and B to be more cautious in stating that interaction took place during this series than was true of the other two districts. The small size of response N, however, leaves even this small difference open to question.

Table 3-D, dealing with counselor perceptions of hostility, appears to reveal more differences than either of the two items thus far utilized to compare districts. A higher proportion of positive responses is seen in District A than in other districts, and District B-C reports more negative perceptions than the other three districts during Series 1. In line with the general findings already reported, three of the four districts report a higher proportion of negative responses during Series 2 than Series 3. Inspection of the table relevant to Series 2 indicates that what appears to happen is that in each district there is a move toward a middle position with respect to the perception of hostility. That is to say that both very negative and very positive responses tend to decrease, while the middle response tends to increase. District differences during Series 2 are quite small.

Table 3-E reveals quite clearly that in three out of four of the district groups, the primary focus of hostility during Series 1 was teachers. This is not quite as pronounced in District E-F as in the other three districts, although the modal focus in this district was also teachers. Apart from teachers, the foci for hostility were parents' own children or other group members. In Series 2 there is some shift from emphasis on teachers to parents' own children. However, the small N makes reliable predictions relative to the dispersion of hostility during Series 2 open to question.

Table 3-F deals with the question of whether the group insisted that the counselor talk or lecture to them. There are some characteristic differences among the four district groups on this particular question. Districts A and B both have well over 50% of their responses falling toward the lower end of the continuum, indicating that there was a minimum of insistence on lecture by the parents. While no district group reported a high percentage of insistence on a lecture approach, both D and E-F reported percentages which were considerably higher than other districts at this end of the continuum. District A and E-F both have considerably higher variance in reporting on this variable, probably due to the fact that the number of responses was higher in these two groups. During the second series, there was a definite shift away from emphasis on lecture in all districts, although the move in District B was toward the middle of the continuum rather than toward the lower end.

Table 3-G explores the perceptions of counselors with respect to the relative worth of group outcomes. Some rather gross differences are seen with respect to this question among the four district groups reported. Only District E-F reported more than 50% of its responses at the positive end of the continuum (Alternatives 4 and 5). One district (D) reported no outcomes at this high a level. District A maintains its place as having the highest dispersion of responses, with approximately 40% at the positive end but with one-third at the lower end of the continuum. Districts D and E-F also reported some results at the negative end of the continuum. Following Series 2, negative counselor responses drop out completely and meaningful differences do not exist among the districts reporting.

Differences among Academic Levels

There are some reasons to believe that counselor responses might differ from one academic level to another. For this reason, data were analyzed in terms of whether they were being reported for elementary, junior high or high school parent groups. No high school results are reported for Series 2, because no Series 2 groups were conducted at that level.

Table 3-H reports on counselor responses to Question 1 of the CRSG by academic level. The highest proportion of positive responses were found at the elementary level, with the lowest proportion of positive responses reported at the high school level. A higher proportion of negative responses was found at the junior high school level during

Series 1. Following Series 2, elementary school responses moved even more strongly in a positive direction, as did the junior high school responses. In the latter case, however, an N of two groups mandates extreme caution in interpretation.

Table 3-I reports school level differences on Question 2, dealing with interaction among parents, as negligible. Approximately equal proportions of responses are found at all three levels for Series 1. The same condition holds true for levels reporting after Series 2.

Table 3-J reports on the question of how much hostility was perceived by counselors from one level to another. There do appear to be some response differences to this item. The high school level reports a considerably higher proportion of hostility following Series 1 than do either of the other grade levels. Conversely, both the elementary and junior high school levels report a considerably lower level of hostility than is indicated by high school counselors. Following Series 1, higher proportions of hostility are reported, both by the junior high and elementary school levels.

Table 3-K reveals considerable variation among the three levels with respect to perceived targets of parental hostility. High school group counselors are unanimous in pinpointing teachers as the focus of parental hostility during Series 1. At the junior high level teachers are the primary focus of hostility, but other group members also share as recipients of hostility. At the elementary level teachers form the modal focus of parental hostility, but children, other group members and, to a lesser extent, the group counselor and even the parent himself are also targets of hostility. Following Series 2, hostility of elementary school parents was directed primarily at teachers or their own children, and secondarily at the group counselor. The single junior high response after Series 2 indicated that hostility was directed toward the children of the members of this group.

Counselors indicate in Table 3-L that there was less insistence on a lecture approach among the elementary school parent groups than among either junior high or high school groups during Series 1. Counselors indicated that during Series 2 there was a decrease in the amount of parental insistence on a lecture approach at the elementary level. The two groups reporting at the junior high level both selected the median response on this item. This represents somewhat of a move toward more, rather than less, of an insistence on lecturing, although the N of 2 would not make for stability of prediction.

Table 3-M indicates that there are rather marked differences among the three grade levels with respect to counselor perceived outcomes of the groups. Counselors at the elementary level are the most positive about group outcomes, while counselors at the high school are least positive. At the other end of the continuum, however, junior high group counselors who occupy a median position with respect to positive responses report the highest proportion of negative responses, followed by the counselors at the elementary level. High school counselors take a generally median position on this item with a relatively small proportion of either positive or negative responses. Following Series 2, elementary counselors moved completely away from negative responses and predominantly toward the positive end of the continuum. The same is true at the junior high level.

TABLE 3-A

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups

All Counselors
(Reported by Percentages)

Item No.	No. of Grps. by Series			Response No. 1 Series			Response No. 2 Series			Response No. 3 Series			Response No. 4 Series			Response No. 5 Series		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1	53	17	4	1.88	0	0	13.20	0	0	18.86	11.76	0	56.60	58.82	25.00	9.43	29.41	75.00
2	53	17	4	1.88	0	0	15.09	0	0	28.30	11.76	0	37.73	70.58	50.00	16.98	17.64	50.00
3	53	17	4	22.64	29.41	25.00	39.62	23.52	0	15.09	41.17	25.00	15.09	5.88	25.00	7.54	0	25.00
4	24	8	3	4.16	0	0	4.16	12.50	0	70.83	37.50	66.66	8.33	50.00	0	12.50	0	33.33
5	53	17	4	19.98	11.76	75.00	35.84	47.05	25.00	39.62	41.17	0	5.66	0	0	1.88	0	0
6	53	17	4	5.66	0	0	16.98	0	0	37.73	23.52	0	32.07	52.94	0	7.54	23.52	100.00

TABLE 3-B

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District (Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 1: How would you describe rapport in this group?

Series 1

District	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
A	27	3.70	18.51	7.40	55.55	14.81
B	5	0	0	20.00	80.00	0
C			(Data not available)			
D	8	0	0	62.50	37.50	0
E & F	13	0	15.38	15.38	61.53	7.69

Series 2

District	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
A	3	0	0	0	33.33	66.66
B	4	0	0	0	100.00	0
C	2	0	0	0	100.00	0
D			(Did not participate)			
E & F	8	0	0	25.00	37.50	37.50

TABLE 3-C

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District
(Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 2: How much interaction was there among parents in this group?

District	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite A Bit	5 A Great Deal
			Series 1			
A	27	3.70	18.51	22.22	33.33	22.22
B	5	0	20.00	20.00	40.00	20.00
C			(Data not available)			
D	8	0	12.50	37.50	50.00	0
E & F	13	0	7.69	38.46	38.46	15.38
			Series 2			
A	3	0	0	33.33	33.33	33.33
B	4	0	0	25.00	75.00	0
C	2	0	0	0	100.00	0
D			(Did not participate)			
E & F	8	0	0	0	75.00	25.00

TABLE 3-D

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District
(Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 3: How much hostility was expressed in this group?

District	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
			Series 1			
A	27	37.03	37.03	7.40	3.70	14.81
B	5	0	40.00	20.00	40.00	0
C		(Data not available)				
D	8	12.50	37.50	12.50	37.50	0
E & F	13	7.69	46.15	30.76	15.38	0
			Series 2			
A	3	66.66	0	33.33	0	0
B	4	25.00	25.00	50.00	0	0
C	2	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
D		(Did not participate)				
E & F	8	25.00	25.00	37.50	12.50	0

TABLE 3-E

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District
(Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 4: (Answer only if answer to Question No. 3 was 3, 4 or 5.) Was this hostility directed primarily towards

District	No. of Responses	1 Self	2 Counselor	3 Teachers	4 Own Child	5 Other Group Members
			Series 1			
A	8	0	0	87.50	0	12.50
B	4	0	0	75.00	25.00	0
C			(Data not available)			
D	4	0	0	100.00	0	0
E & F	8	12.50	12.50	37.50	12.50	25.00
			Series 2			
A	1	0	0	0	100.00	0
B	2	0	0	50.00	50.00	0
C	1	0	0	100.00	0	0
D			(Did not participate)			
E & F	4	0	25.00	25.00	50.00	0

TABLE 3-F

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District (Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 5: Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

Series 1

District	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
A	27	25.92	33.33	37.03	3.70	0
B	5	0	60.00	40.00	0	0
C			(Data not available)			
D	8	0	37.50	50.00	12.50	0
E & F	13	15.38	30.76	38.46	7.69	7.69
			Series 2			
A	3	33.33	66.66	0	0	0
B	4	0	25.00	75.00	0	0
C	2	0	50.00	50.00	0	0
D			(Did not participate)			
E & F	8	12.50	50.00	37.50	0	0

TABLE 3-G

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By District
(Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 6: What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

District	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
			Series 1			
A	27	11.11	22.22	25.92	29.62	11.11
B	5	0	0	60.00	40.00	0
C			(Data not available)			
D	8	0	12.50	87.50	0	0
E & F	13	0	15.38	23.07	53.84	7.69
			Series 2			
A	3	0	0	33.33	33.33	33.33
B	4	0	0	25.00	75.00	0
C	2	0	0	0	100.00	0
D			(Did not participate)			
E & F	8	0	0	25.00	37.50	37.50

TABLE 3-H

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By Grade Level (Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 1: How would you describe rapport in this group?

Series 1

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
Elementary	21	0	9.52	14.28	66.66	9.52
Junior High	20	5.00	25.00	5.00	50.00	15.00
High School	12	0	0	50.00	50.00	0

Series 2

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
Elementary	15	0	0	6.66	66.66	26.66
Junior High	2	0	0	50.00	0	50.00

TABLE 3-I

Question No. 2: How much interaction was there among parents in this group?

Series 1

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
Elementary	21	4.76	9.52	28.57	33.33	23.80
Junior High	20	0	20.00	25.00	40.00	15.00
High School	12	0	16.66	33.33	41.66	8.33

Series 2

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
Elementary	15	0	0	13.33	66.66	20.00
Junior High	2	0	0	0	100.00	0

TABLE 3-J

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By Grade Level
(Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 3: How much hostility was expressed in this group?

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
			Series 1			
Elementary	21	14.28	52.38	19.04	9.52	4.76
Junior High	20	40.00	30.00	10.00	5.00	15.00
High School	12	8.33	33.33	16.66	41.66	0
			Series 2			
Elementary	15	26.66	26.66	46.66	0	0
Junior High	2	50.00	0	0	50.00	0

TABLE 3-K

Question No. 4: (Answer only if answer to Question No. 3 was 3, 4 or 5.) Was this hostility directed primarily towards

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Self	2 Counselor	3 Teachers	4 Own Child	5 Other Group Members
			Series 1			
Elementary	11	9.09	9.09	45.45	18.18	18.18
Junior High	6	0	0	83.33	0	16.66
High School	7	0	0	100.00	0	0
			Series 2			
Elementary	7	0	14.28	42.85	42.85	0
Junior High	1	0	0	0	100.00	0

TABLE 3-L

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups: By Grade Level (Reported by Percentages)

Question No. 5: Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Almost None	2 Very Little	3 A Fair Amount	4 Quite a Bit	5 A Great Deal
			Series 1			
Elementary	21	33.33	28.57	28.57	4.76	4.76
Junior High	20	10.00	40.00	45.00	5.00	0
High School	12	0	41.66	50.00	8.33	0
			Series 2			
Elementary	15	13.33	53.33	33.33	0	0
Junior High	2	0	0	100.00	0	0

TABLE 3-M

Question No. 6: What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

Grade Level	No. of Responses	1 Poor	2 Not So Good	3 Fair	4 Very Good	5 Excellent
			Series 1			
Elementary	21	9.52	9.52	28.57	42.85	9.52
Junior High	20	5.00	30.00	25.00	30.00	10.00
High School	12	0	8.33	75.00	16.66	0
			Series 2			
Elementary	15	0	0	20.00	60.00	20.00
Junior High	2	0	0	50.00	0	50.00

Chapter 4

Interrelationships between Parent and Counselor Responses

The problem of validating either counselor or client perceptions of counseling is an old one and one that continues to plague the researcher in this field. One way of attempting to validate such perceptions is to attempt to determine the extent to which they are interrelated. This is admittedly not in any sense a final test of the validity of such perceptions. On the other hand, failure to find any relationship between such perceptions could certainly indicate that counselor and client were not living in the same perceptual world.

The data intercorrelated included the objective items from Counselor Responses to Specific Groups, General Counselor Reactions and the Post-Series Reaction Sheets completed by the parents. These data were intercorrelated in two ways. First, the group means on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet were correlated with the items from the General Counselor Reactions and Counselor Responses to Specific Groups. In addition, the responses of individuals in each of the groups were correlated with counselor responses. Through utilization of the latter technique, relationships which might be covered through utilization of mean responses can be discerned. In addition, the items on these three instruments were intercorrelated both with and without the inclusion of data from the high school groups. Exclusion of the high school groups does not markedly reduce the total N and is justified on the basis of the fact that such groups met for different numbers of meetings and for a different purpose than did the elementary and junior high school groups.

Correlations between Group Means of Parent and Counselor Responses

Table 4-A reports the correlations between the Post-Series Reaction Sheet mean scores for each group and the Counselor Responses to Specific Groups. There are no correlations significant at the .05 level. However, there are four relationships significant between the .05 and .10 level. Item 4 of the PSRS and Items 2 and 3 of the CRSG correlate significantly at this level. This finding indicates an inverse relationship between counselor perceptions of the quantity of interaction among parents in the group, counselor perceptions of amount of hostility expressed in the group and parental willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to their friends. Item 6 of the CRSG is significantly correlated with Item 2 of the PSRS, indicating that counselors' general positiveness about outcomes is related to parent perceptions of the lack of negative results.

Table 4-B reports intercorrelations between items of the PSRS and the GCR. In this instance, certain substantial correlations are found. Item 1 on the GCR and Item 2 on the PSRS are significantly correlated at the .05 level. This finding indicates a significant relationship between the mean responses of parent groups' perceptions of lack of negative results from group participation and counselor willingness to recommend group work with parents as an effective technique. There is also a significant correlation between Item 2 on the GCR and Item 2 of the PSRS. This outcome denotes a positive relationship between counselor feeling with respect to introducing parent group counseling as a part of a regular guidance program and the perceptions of parent groups with respect to lack of negative results from group participation.

Table 4-C reports correlations between items of the PSRS and CRSG, with the high school sample eliminated. The pattern of correlations is identical to those found in Table 4-A, with the exception that Item 1 of the PSRS and Item 1 of the CRSG are also related at the .10 level in Table 4-C. This finding indicates positive relationship between the counselors' perceptions of rapport in the group and the parent groups' perception of helpfulness of the group experience.

Table 4-D reports intercorrelations between the PSRS and CRSG for Series 2. Three significant correlations appear in this table. These are found in the relationships which exist between Item 2 on the CRSG and Items 2, 3 and 4 on the PSRS. These correlations indicate relationships between counselor perceptions of interaction and parental perceptions of negative results, perceived changes in child behavior and parental reluctance to recommend participation in a similar group to friends. It appears that the item dealing with counselor perceptions of interaction in the group is highly predictive of certain parental group responses, although not in the direction which would ordinarily be assumed. When counselor perceptions of group interaction are high, the group's perception of negative results are higher and there is a decline in the willingness of group participants to recommend participation in a similar group to friends. At the same time, the group's perception of behavior changes in children increases. This is a puzzling phenomenon that may indicate that the groups were subjectively more satisfied with more directive, structured counselors but that their dissatisfaction with the group led them to take some actions with respect to their children which resulted in behavior changes. This finding clearly deserves further study.

Correlations between Individual Means of Parent and Counselor Responses: Series 1

The results of intercorrelating items from the CRSG with those of the individual parents PSRS are indicated in Table 4-E. The number of significant correlations is considerably higher in this table than was found for group correlations which were reported in Tables 4-A and 4-C. This is probably due to the considerably larger N, and only relationships significant at the .05 level or below are reported. Six correlations at the .01 level and two correlations significant at the .05 level are reflected in Table 4-E. One item of the PSRS (Item 3) and one item of the CRSG (Item 3) fail to correlate significantly with any other item. Item 1 of the PSRS was correlated with three items from the CRSG. These were Items 1, 2 and 6. This finding indicates significant relationships between the individual parent's perceptions of the helpfulness of the group on one hand, and counselor perceptions of rapport, interaction and counselor feelings about group outcomes on the other. Item 2 of the PSRS was also correlated with three items of the CRSG. These correlations indicate positive relationships between this item and Items 1 and 6 of the CRSG and a negative relationship between Item 2 of the PSRS and Item 5 of the CRSG. Parent perceptions of lack of negative responses are related to counselor perceptions of rapport in the group and to counselor perceptions of general group outcomes. There is also a relationship between individual parent perceptions of increased negative results and counselor perceptions of group insistence that they talk or lecture to the group.

Item 3a of the PSRS correlates with Item 2 of the CRSG. This finding indicates that the higher the counselor perceived interaction to be among parents in the group, the more parents tended to perceive changes in their child's behavior had been for the worse rather than for the better. Item 4 of the PSRS correlates with both Item 1 and Item 6 of the CRSG. This indicates a significant relationship between the willingness of parents to recommend participation in a similar group to friends and counselor perceptions of rapport and general feelings about outcomes in a particular group.

It is only possible to speculate on the reasons why high perceived interaction on the part of counselors is related to parent perceptions of negative results and a lack of willingness on the part of parents to recommend participation in similar groups to their friends. It is possible that inexperienced group counselors are too hasty in attempting to promote group interaction and that they fail to establish the rapport that is necessary before stimulating interaction. In so doing, they may, in the eyes of the parent participants, abdicate leadership and promote the development of a group atmosphere which is essentially leaderless and unstructured. Considering the setting in which counseling is taking place and the reasons which most parents have for participating, such a development would not be expected to have a favorable impact on the group. The results might well be negative in terms of participant perceptions.

Table 4-F reports the strength of relationships existing between GCR and individual PSRS responses. Item 1 of the GCR correlates with Items 1 and 2 of the individual PSRS. These outcomes indicate a relationship between counselor willingness to recommend working with parent groups as an effective technique and the individual parent perceptions of the helpfulness of the groups and lack of negative results stemming from their group participation.

Item 2 of the GCR correlates at the .05 level with Item 2 of the PSRS, indicating a relationship between counselor desire to see a program of parent group counseling introduced in their own systems and individual parent perceptions of lack of negative results stemming from participation in group counseling. No significant correlations were found between Item 3 of the GCR and any of the items of the PSRS.

Correlation between Counselor and Parent Perceptions by Individuals: Series 2

Table 4-G reports the results between individual PSRS and the CRSG for Series 2. Fewer correlations are found between parent and counselor perceptions in Series 2 than in Series 1. This is probably due in part to a marked decrease in variance of response from Series 1 to Series 2 for both counselors and parents, as well as to a decrease in the number of responses. Three significant correlations are found, all of them related to Item 3 of the individual PSRS. This item correlates with Items 2, 3 and 6 of the CRSG. These findings indicate a significant degree of relationship between the individual parent perceptions of changes in child behavior around the home and counselor perceptions of the amount of interaction among parents, lack of hostility expressed in the groups, and general feelings about group outcomes.

There is a distinct shift in the nature of significant correlations between Series 1 (Table 4-E) and Series 2 (Table 4-G). During Series 1, affective rather than behavioral indices are found to be intercorrelated. Following Series 2, the significant correlations are found between parent and counselor perceptions of actual behavioral change. Thus, it appears that the longer parents and counselors are exposed to group counseling, the more do they tend to view outcomes in terms of behavior change, rather than in terms of liking or disliking the experience.

Table 4-H indicates the outcomes obtained from correlating items from the GCR with those of the PSRS following Series 2. In this instance, Item 3 of the GCR was found to be correlated with Items 1 and 4 of the PSRS. These results indicate significant relationships between counselor perceptions of the impact of group work on the children of participating parents and parent perceptions of the helpfulness of the group discussions and the willingness of parents to recommend participation in a similar group to their friends.

TABLE 4-A

Correlations between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Responses by Groups

Series 1

CRSG Variable	PSRS				
	$\frac{1}{X}$	$\frac{2}{X}$	$\frac{3}{X}$	$\frac{3a}{X}$	$\frac{4}{X}$
	N=43	N=43	N=43	N=24	N=43
1	.217	.222	-.060	.138	-.203
2	.100	.123	-.170	.215	.298*
3	.042	-.101	-.086	-.214	.269*
5	.035	-.231	.135	-.152	.108
6	.179	.288*	-.175	.254	.141

TABLE 4-B

Correlations between General Counselor Reactions and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Responses by Groups

Series 1

GCR Variable	PSRS				
	$\frac{1}{X}$	$\frac{2}{X}$	$\frac{3}{X}$	$\frac{3a}{X}$	$\frac{4}{X}$
	N=31	N=31	N=31	N=17	N=31
1	.125	.383**	-.244	-.253	.088
2	-.003	.380**	-.262	-.210	.114
3	.093	.267	-.185	.263	.269

*Significant at .10 level
**Significant at .05 level

TABLE 4-C

Correlations between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Responses by Groups (High School Group Out)

Series 1

CRSG Variable			PSRS		
	1 $\bar{X}$ N=38	2 $\bar{X}$ N=38	3 $\bar{X}$ N=38	3a $\bar{X}$ N=23	4 $\bar{X}$ N=38
1	.284*	.211	-.038	.122	-.238
2	.151	.094	-.199	.225	.324**
3	-.031	-.154	-.070	-.189	.310*
5	.009	-.239	.176	-.163	.131
6	.190	.289*	-.165	.249	.153

TABLE 4-D

Correlations between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Responses by Groups

Series 2

CRSG Variable			PSRS		
	1 $\bar{X}$ N=15	2 $\bar{X}$ N=15	3 $\bar{X}$ N=15	3a $\bar{X}$ N=15	4 $\bar{X}$ N=15
1	.071	-.115	.339	-.100	.023
2	-.232	-.464*	.449*	-.055	.497*
3	.253	.008	-.288	-.069	-.266
5	-.089	-.172	-.230	-.080	-.272
6	-.041	-.247	.364	.000	.372

*Significant at .10 level
**Significant at .05 level

TABLE 4-E

Correlations between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Individual Parent Responses

Series 1

CRSG	PSRS 1 N=312	 2 N=312	 3 N=312	 3a N=71	 4 N=312
1	.223**	.141*	.060	.135	-.193**
2	.138*	.056	-.012	.242*	-.046
3	.001	-.051	-.064	-.098	.046
5	-.012	-.148**	.084	-.122	-.005
6	.218**	.155**	-.013	.180	-.152**

TABLE 4-F

Correlations between General Counselor Reactions and Post-Series Reaction Sheet Individual Parent Responses

Series 1

GCR	PSRS 1 N=171	 2 N=171	 3 N=171	 3a N=33	 4 N=171
1	.167*	.204**	-.095	-.160	-.115
2	.135	.198*	-.109	-.143	-.093
3	.129	.142	-.015	.217	-.072

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

TABLE 4-G

Correlations between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups
and Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Individual Parent Responses

Series 2

CRSG	PSRS 1 N=100	 2 N=100	 3 N=100	 3a N=30	 4 N=100
1	.088	-.051	.164	-.121	-.080
2	-.063	-.133	.240*	-.058	-.007
3	.175	-.013	-.196*	.036	-.186
5	-.001	-.130	-.116	-.042	-.054
6	.084	-.107	.197*	-.070	-.030

TABLE 4-H

Correlations between General Counselor Reactions
and Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Individual Parent Responses

Series 2

GCR	PSRS 1 N=57	 2 N=57	 3 N=57	 3a N=12	 4 N-57
1	-.142	-.055	-.075	.000	.089
2	-.142	-.055	-.075	.000	.089
3	.472**	.187	.196	.000	-.336**

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

Chapter 5

Parent Attendance Patterns

Actual parent attendance at meetings is a firm behavioral index which can be utilized in several ways. First, it can be used to determine the extent to which parent interest was sustained throughout the course of the groups. Second, the interrelationships between attendance patterns and parent and counselor responses to the post experimental instruments should indicate whether or not there is a relationship between parent and counselor perceptions and attendance at specific meetings or at more or fewer meetings. In an indirect sense, attendance is a check on the validity of parent and counselor responses.

Tables 5-A and 5-B report the percentage of parents who attended each of the five meetings of Series 1 and the four meetings of Series 2. Study of these tables will indicate that at no point did 100% of the parents attend any given meeting. This means that parents came to later meetings who did not attend the first meeting.

The most precipitous decline in attendance followed Meeting 1 of Series 1. Unfortunately, it is impossible to ascribe this decline solely to the nature of the groups, since Meeting 1 was used to collect certain pre-experimental data from the parents. The decline in attendance from Meeting 1 to Meeting 2 may be due in large measure to negative parental feelings about having completed several instruments which probed some fairly sensitive attitudes. The decline in attendance from Meeting 2 to Meeting 5 of Series 1 was just 50%.

Attendance at Series 2 presents an entirely different pattern. While the proportion of attendance at Meeting No. 1 of the second series is almost identical to that of Meeting No. 1 of the first series, there was not, during any of the four sessions of Series 2, the precipitous decline in attendance which was apparent throughout Series 1. Attendance at the last meeting of Series 2 was twice as high as that achieved during the last meeting of Series 1.

It would appear that parents who attended the second series had more or less firmly made up their minds about the worth of participation in parent group counseling, and the actual decline in attendance from Meeting 1 to Meeting 4 of the second series was only 15%; whereas the decline in attendance from the first to the last meeting of Series 1 was 48%.

Interrelationships between Parent Attendance and Subjective Parent Reactions to Group Participation

Table 5-C reflects the parent responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet following Series 1. The data are broken down by the number of meetings attended by each participant who completed the PSRS. On Item 1 there is a clear trend for parents who participated in more meetings to respond more positively than those who attended fewer times.

The results of Item 2 indicate a somewhat different picture. In this instance, there is a slight increase in the number of both positive and negative responses, with a consequent move away from neutral responses. This outcome may indicate that as the proportion of meetings attended increased, the responses of participants became more highly differentiated.

Responses to Item 3 indicate that parents tend to perceive a much higher proportion of change in their children's behavior as their participation in the group increased. Whether these represent only perceived changes or actual changes is impossible to determine, but there does seem to be greater awareness of child behavior among those who participated in a larger number of sessions.

Data resulting from Item 3a indicate that a more differentiated response is made by parents as their exposure to the groups is increased. The absolute number of positive responses increased markedly with group exposure from a low of three to a high of 29. Interpretation of responses for those who attended relatively few meetings is made difficult by the low number of responses and the presumable lack of reliability which accompanies the low response total.

On Item 4 there is a definite, almost linear, increase in positive response from parents who attended only one out of five sessions through those who attended five out of five.

The relationship of parent responses to the PSRS and number of meetings attended for Series 2 is reflected in Table 5-D. Responses to Question 1 are, in contrast with results obtained for the first series, definitely positive from the outset. There is a trend for parent responses to become both more positive and slightly more negative as attendance increases, with a consequent move away from the neutral position.

The results obtained on Question 2 of Series 2 are most interesting in that there is a slight tendency for those who came to three or four sessions to perceive more bad outcome than those who came to only one or two. While the total response is still markedly positive, there is nevertheless a definite tendency for those who attended three or four meetings to increase either in their ambivalence toward or their negative feelings toward outcomes occurring as a result of their participation in the group. This may possibly grow out of the fact that parents who continued for the second series were those whose children had more serious problems, and they may have been disappointed if the groups did not assist materially in resolving fairly serious problems.

On the other hand, Item 3 clearly indicates that those who came to a larger number of meetings perceived more changes in their children's behavior. Responses to this item in the second series are generally more positive than responses to the same item in the first series.

The changes perceived by parents who participated in Series 2 were, with the exception of a single response, all for the better. There is no relationship between time spent in the groups and the positiveness or negativeness of perceived behavior outcomes. On the other hand, there is a definite increase in the absolute number of positive responses from those who attended only one session through those who attended all four sessions. Responses to this item following Series 2 were much more positive than following Series 1.

Responses to Item 4 do not differentiate among those who attended different numbers of group counseling sessions during Series 2. Participation was recommended by all but two individuals, both of whom stayed for only one out of four sessions. Responses to this item during Series 2 are generally more positive than responses to the same item following Series 1.

In comparing outcomes from Series 1 with those obtained from Series 2, it appears that two things happen with longer participation. The first and most obvious thing which occurs is that responses to the group sessions are more positive from the outset and tend to become even more positive with increased participation. The second thing which happens, and which is more difficult to illustrate, is that increased participation in the groups does, on some items, bring about an increased differentiation of response. Thus, on some items, while the general trend is towards more positive response, there is at the same time an increase in negative response. In these instances, of course, there is a move away from the neutral response.

Correlations between Group Attendance and Post-Series Reaction Sheets

Still another way of examining the attendance data in its relationship to parent response is to correlate attendance at a specific meeting with parent perceptions of the group experience. Tables 5-E through 5-H reflect the data when analyzed in this way. Tables 5-E and 5-F represent correlations based on group means, while Tables 5-G and 5-H are correlations based on individual responses.

Table 5-E indicates the relationship between attendance at group counseling sessions during Series 1 and responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. Six significant correlations were obtained on two items. These were Item No. 1 dealing with perceptions of the helpfulness of group discussions and Item No. 3a which reflects whether perceived behavior changes in children were for the better or the worse. There is a significant relationship between attendance at

Meeting No. 4 and perceptions of the helpfulness of group discussions. Correlations very close to significance were also reflected in attendance at Meeting No. 5 and the total number of meetings attended by parents. Significant correlations between positive perceptions of behavioral outcomes (Item 3a) and attendance at Meeting No. 3 and Meeting No. 5 were obtained. Significant correlation between outcomes on the same item and the total number of meetings attended, number at the first group and number at the last group were also obtained.

Table 5-F reports correlations obtained following Series 2 between attendance at a specific session and the PSRS. During Series 2 only one significant correlation was obtained. This was a negative relationship between group attendance at the first meeting and Item 3a. A major problem in attaining significant correlation during Series 2 was the low N, requiring a high correlation to achieve significance.

Tables 5-G and 5-H reflect relationship between individual parent responses to the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and attendance at the groups. During Series 1 only Items 1 and 4 reflect any significant correlation between attendance at a specific meeting and parent response. Item 1 reflects a significant and steadily increasing correlation beginning with the second meeting and going through the fifth meeting. There is also a significant relationship between Item 1 and the average number of meetings attended.

Significant relationships exist between Item 4 and attendance at Meeting Nos. 4 and 5, as well as average number of meetings attended. It thus appears that during the first series attendance at the first meeting does not predict parent response to any of the items on the

PSRS. This is understandable since this meeting was almost entirely used for data collection. Attendance at later meetings is predictive of both parent perceptions of the helpfulness of group counseling and of the willingness of parents to recommend such participation to friends.

Results obtained during Series 2 are similar in many respects to those obtained during Series 1. Responses to both Items 1 and 4 are again significantly correlated with attendance at later group sessions (No. 3 and 4). In this instance, however, they are also significantly correlated with attendance at the first session. This may well be indicative of the commitment or expectation brought to Series 2 by parents who had already participated in Series 1.

Additional items attain significance during Series 2. Item No. 2 dealing with perceptions of negative results becomes significantly correlated at the fourth meeting (the perceptions of negative results decrease), as does Item No. 3 dealing with parent perceptions of changes in child behavior. In addition, Item 3a is significantly correlated with attendance at the first meeting of Series 2 and with the average number of meetings attended. It appears that participation later in the second series is highly related to parent perceptions of positive outcomes. It is also apparent that there is a relationship between positive parent perceptions and the average number of meetings attended.

Relationships between Parent Attendance Patterns and Counselor Perceptions

Tables 5-I and 5-J reflect correlations between parent attendance at specific meetings and counselor reactions to specific groups. Three items from the counselor form correlate significantly with attendance variables. These are Items 1, 2 and 6. Two significant correlations are found between Item 1 and attendance variables. These occur in connection with Meeting No. 4 and the number of persons in attendance at the last meeting. There appears to be a relationship between counselor perceptions of rapport and attendance later in the group sessions.

There is a correlation between Item 2 and attendance at Meeting No. 3. It should be pointed out that relatively high correlations are obtained between Item 2 and attendance at Meetings 4 and 5, as well as the number of individuals attending the last session. There does appear, then, to be a relationship between counselor perceptions of group interaction and attendance, particularly following the first two sessions.

Item 6 dealing with counselor feelings about outcomes is significantly correlated with attendance at Meeting Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5, as well as with the number of persons who attended the last meeting. Thus, counselors do appear to equate the number of persons in attendance with positiveness of group outcomes.

Table No. 5-J reflects correlations between attendance variables and counselor perceptions of group outcomes for Series 2. Only two significant correlations are reflected by this entire table. It should be pointed out that one of the problems here, as with previous correlations, has been the highly restricted range of response which is sometimes reflected. This tends to be especially true during the second series. Item 3 is negatively correlated with the number who attended the first group meeting of the second series. This must be interpreted to mean that high attendance was equated by the counselors as indicative of low hostility during the first session. The only other significant correlation occurred between Item 6 and the number of persons attending the last group session. This would appear to indicate a strong relationship between counselor perceptions of group outcomes and attendance at the last group meeting.

During Series 1 there are a number of significant correlations between certain attendance variables and certain counselor perceptions. It seems reasonable to say that these relationships tend to be stronger toward the end of the series rather than at the beginning. During Series 2 there are many fewer significant correlations, primarily due to the invariance of counselor response which tended to be skewed in a highly positive direction. The counselors do appear to relate positiveness of group outcomes with attendance, particularly later in the series. It should also be mentioned that counselor perceptions of the concepts of rapport and interaction are also related to attendance during Series 1.

Table 5-K reflects correlations between general counselor reactions and attendance patterns for Series 1. A similar table was not prepared for Series 2 due to the low N, which would make the correlations essentially meaningless. Only one significant correlation is reflected in Table 5-K. This is the correlation between attendance at Meeting No. 4 and Item No. 3 of the General Counselor Reaction Sheet, which reflects counselor opinions on whether the group work had any impact on the children of participating parents. The similar correlation for Meeting No. 3 and for Meeting No. 5 is also high, but neither is significant. It does appear that there is a relationship between parent attendance at later group sessions and counselor perceptions of whether or not the group work had an impact on children.

TABLE 5-A

Percentage of Attendance at Meetings of Series 1 (Elementary and Junior High School Only)

Meeting Number	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	805	79.67%	24.54%
2	805	60.70	16.50
3	805	47.53	22.95
4	805	39.47	23.10
5	805	31.91	22.83

TABLE 5-B

Percentage of Attendance at Meetings of Series 2

Meeting Number	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	202	78.26%	19.77%
2	202	69.65	22.12
3	202	64.52	21.01
4	202	63.76	21.93

TABLE 5-C*

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Series 1

Question No. 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1 of 5	25		28.0	36.0	8.0	16.0	12.0	
2 of 5	38		13.2	31.6	23.7	15.8	15.8	
3 of 5	66		9.1	28.8	19.7	21.2	21.2	
4 of 5	86		1.2	15.1	27.9	30.2	25.6	
5 of 5	93		.0	12.9	26.9	25.8	34.4	

Question No. 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in group discussions?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Very much so	1	2	3	4	5	Not at all
1 of 5	26		.0	.0	3.8	15.4	80.8	
2 of 5	38		2.6	.0	10.5	2.6	84.2	
3 of 5	65		.0	.0	3.1	12.3	84.6	
4 of 5	86		.0	2.3	3.5	14.0	80.2	
5 of 5	93		.0	3.2	5.4	8.6	82.8	

Question No. 3: Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1 of 5	26		61.5	23.1	11.5	3.8	.0	
2 of 5	37		45.9	32.4	16.2	5.4	.0	
3 of 5	65		56.9	24.6	6.2	9.2	3.1	
4 of 5	85		43.5	22.4	24.7	4.7	4.7	
5 of 5	92		51.1	21.7	16.3	8.7	2.2	

*Reported by percentages.

TABLE 5-C (Cont'd)

Question No. 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the better or worse?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Better	Worse
1 of 5	3	100.0	.0
2 of 5	6	83.3	16.7
3 of 5	11	100.0	.0
4 of 5	29	82.8	17.2
5 of 5	27	88.9	11.1

Question No. 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Yes	No
1 of 5	26	76.9	23.1
2 of 5	37	83.8	16.2
3 of 5	64	90.6	9.4
4 of 5	84	97.6	2.4
5 of 5	93	95.7	4.3

TABLE 5-D*

Post-Series Reaction Sheet
Series 2

Question No. 1: Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1 of 4	8		25.0	.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	
2 of 4	13		.0	.0	46.2	23.1	30.8	
3 of 4	26		.0	.0	26.9	42.3	30.8	
4 of 4	35		.0	2.9	2.9	42.9	51.4	

Question No. 2: Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in group discussions?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Very much so	1	2	3	4	5	Not at all
1 of 4	8		.0	.0	.0	37.5	62.5	
2 of 4	13		.0	.0	.0	7.7	92.3	
3 of 4	26		.0	.0	3.8	11.5	84.6	
4 of 4	34		2.9	.0	8.8	2.9	85.3	

Question No. 3: Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much so
1 of 4	8		75.0	12.5	12.5	.0	.0	
2 of 4	13		38.5	15.4	23.1	15.4	7.7	
3 of 4	26		42.3	23.1	15.4	11.5	7.7	
4 of 4	33		33.3	33.3	18.2	15.2	.0	

*Reported by percentages.

TABLE 5-D (Cont'd)

Question No. 3a: If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the better or worse?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Better	Worse
1 of 4	1	.0	100.0
2 of 4	5	100.0	.0
3 of 4	8	100.0	.0
4 of 4	9	100.0	.0

Question No. 4: Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems?

No. of Meetings Attended	N	Yes	No
1 of 4	8	75.0	25.0
2 of 4	13	100.0	.0
3 of 4	26	100.0	.0
4 of 4	35	100.0	.0

TABLE 5-E

Post-Series Reaction Sheet:
Correlations with Attendance Variables
Responses by Groups
Series 1

Meeting No.	Question No. 1 N=40	2 N=40	3 N=40	3a N=25	4 N=40
1	0.156	-0.162	-0.027	0.210	-0.168
2	-0.007	-0.044	-0.055	0.225	-0.054
3	-0.010	-0.029	-0.146	0.374*	0.198
4	0.335*	0.169	0.012	0.226	0.067
5	0.300	0.015	0.010	0.422**	-0.033
Ave. Number Mtgs. Att.	0.302	0.003	-0.047	0.414**	-0.020
N at First Group	0.206	-0.158	-0.090	0.349*	0.040
N at Last Group	0.231	0.115	-0.007	0.448**	0.057

TABLE 5-F

Post-Series Reaction Sheet:
Correlations with Attendance Variables
Responses by Groups
Series 2

Meeting No.	Question No. 1 N=18	2 N=18	3 N=18	3a N=18	4 N=18
1	-0.091	-0.089	-0.220	-0.592**	0.091
2	-0.023	-0.180	0.049	0.156	0.258
3	0.334	-0.277	0.105	0.087	-0.004
4	0.257	-0.373	0.139	0.281	0.252
Ave. Number Mtgs. Att.	0.172	-0.319	0.019	-0.021	0.162
N at First Group	-0.349	0.142	-0.210	-0.472	0.238
N at Last Group	0.096	-0.020	-0.033	-0.055	0.149

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-G

Post-Series Reaction Sheet:
Correlations with Attendance Variables
Individual Parent Responses
Series 1

Meeting No.	Question No.				
	1 N=318	2 N=318	3 N=318	3a N=73	4 N=318
1	-0.085	-0.046	-0.053	-0.053	0.075
2	0.119*	-0.056	0.036	-0.015	-0.088
3	0.213**	-0.005	0.050	0.021	-0.078
4	0.336**	-0.040	-0.012	0.064	-0.210**
5	0.335**	0.057	0.146*	0.076	-0.256**
Average No. Mtgs. Att.	0.350**	-0.044	0.065	0.058	-0.219**
$\bar{X}$	3.380	4.745	1.841	1.123	1.082
S.D.	1.229	.620	1.063	.328	.275

TABLE 5-H

Post-Series Reaction Sheet:
Correlations with Attendance Variables
Individual Parent Responses
Series 2

Meeting No.	Question No.				
	1 N=120	2 N=120	3 N=120	3a N=33	4 N=120
1	0.245**	-0.052	-0.088	-0.375*	-0.267**
2	-0.016	-0.010	-0.166	-0.233	0.068
3	0.246**	-0.157	0.194	-0.288	-0.202*
4	0.377**	0.200*	0.245**	0.055	-0.282*
Average No. Mtgs. Att.	0.392**	-0.012	0.069	-0.445*	-0.310*
$\bar{X}$	4.050	4.756	2.094	1.030	1.016
S.D.	.874	.647	1.176	.171	.128

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-I

Correlations Between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Attendance Patterns by Groups

(Elementary and Junior High Only)

Series 1

N=41 Meeting No.	Question No.				
	1	2	3	5	6
1	-0.156	-0.168	-0.181	0.032	-0.144
2	0.217	0.119	0.090	-0.036	0.309*
3	0.221	0.352*	0.052	-0.066	0.448*
4	0.322*	0.294	-0.021	-0.173	0.432*
5	0.256	0.266	0.092	-0.008	0.358*
N at First Group	-0.069	0.012	0.097	0.211	-0.043
N at Last Group	0.347*	0.277	0.121	0.082	0.348*

TABLE 5-J

Correlations Between Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Attendance Patterns by Groups

(Elementary and Junior High Only)

Series 2

N=15

Meeting No.	Question No.				
	1	2	3	5	6
1	-0.041	-0.093	-0.051	-0.031	-0.110
2	0.064	0.279	-0.043	-0.015	0.338
3	0.174	-0.050	0.344	0.030	0.036
4	0.199	0.254	0.078	0.112	0.348
N at First Group	0.199	0.099	-0.558*	-0.244	0.334
N at Last Group	0.429	0.269	-0.182	0.016	0.668**

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 5-K

Correlations Between General Counselor Reactions and Attendance Patterns by Groups

(Elementary and Junior High Only)

Series 1

N=31

Meeting No.	Question No. 1	2	3
1	0.048	0.174	0.113
2	0.307	0.182	0.213
3	0.273	0.180	0.305
4	0.263	0.138	0.375*
5	0.221	0.062	0.243

*Significant at .05 level.

Chapter 6

Summary

This chapter will highlight the major findings which have been reported in the preceding five chapters. These data are highly complex and some attempt will be made here to interpret their meaning.

Parent Responses

It is reasonable to state that parent responses at all school levels and in all three counseling series were strikingly positive. There is always, of course, the nagging doubt that halo effect will overemphasize the actual positiveness of such data, and this of course must be borne in mind. On the other hand, parent response data are so positive that halo effect cannot account for even the largest share of response. In addition, certain relationships which exist in this data tend to heighten belief in its validity. Included in this latter category must be the fact that there is an increase in the positiveness of response from Series 1 to Series 3. The most positive responses were found following Series 2, and this finding, along with others which will be mentioned, make it reasonable to hypothesize that parents whose children have the most serious problems remain longest in the groups and that these problems are perhaps so serious that they are not as satisfied as parents with less serious problems who dropped out following Series 2.

Although junior high parents respond in a manner highly favorable to their counseling experience, there is a tendency for them to perceive the groups less favorably than either elementary or senior high parent groups. At this point, it is not clear whether this is due to counselor differences, to differences in the intensity of problems manifest by the sample of parents who participated at each level, or to the fact that parents consider seventh graders more of a problem than first graders or ninth graders. It will eventually be possible to check out the first two possibilities with data currently available.

Actual behavior changes are reported most by the parents of first grade children, and least frequently by the parents of high school children. It is interesting that high school parents responded less favorably on this item than did the parents of junior high school children, since the latter group perceived the groups to be less helpful than did the former.

The data reflect wide differences from one district to another on most items. At the moment these differences can only be noted. Whether they reflect differences in counselors or in parents who attended in different districts will be determined in the future. It should be remembered that different proportions of elementary, junior high and high school students are represented in each district. Therefore, differences from district to district may also represent age level differences in children.

The distribution of parent responses in Year One and Year Two are approximately the same. The responses appear to be slightly more favorable during Year Two, but there are no gross differences.

Counselor Responses

Counselor responses are seen to become more positive as parents remain longer in counseling. This held true on nearly all items. It would be wise to attempt a study in the future to determine whether this shift to a more positive outlook is related to actual changes in the group process and in clients, or to shifts in counselor perceptions as they become more comfortable with the groups.

Questions relating to hostility reveal that counselors believe that the focus of parental hostility shifts as counseling progresses. At the outset the greatest hostility, according to counselors, is expressed toward teachers. During Series 2 counselors reported that parent hostility was directed most toward their own children. It is interesting to speculate on whether continued counseling for those who remained might shift the target of hostility still further toward participating individuals themselves.

Counselors clearly equate success or the worthwhileness of the group experience to the parents with the length of time parents remain in the groups. This holds true up through Series 2, but falls off somewhat after Series 2. In this respect, counselor perceptions parallel parent perceptions, and this similarity suggests that these mutual perceptions have some validity.

Few differences were found among districts on counselor responses. The few differences which were seen occurred during the first series, and after that no great differences were found among counselors from different districts.

Counselors who dealt with elementary level parents tended to perceive outcomes most positively, while those who worked at the junior high level tended to perceive outcomes least positively. Again, marked similarity between parent and counselor responses is evidenced in that precisely the same situation held among the parents. This finding lends further support to the idea that parent problems at the junior high school level may be different from those at the elementary and high school levels.

Correlations between Parent and Counselor Responses

In view of the relatively restricted range of responses from both counselors and parents, it is surprising that any significant correlations were found. In spite of this situation which mitigates against the possibility of significant correlations, a surprising number of significant relationships were brought to light. The number of correlations discovered was markedly higher following Series 2 than after Series 1. In addition, the significant correlations which were found after Series 2 appeared more related to behavior than to attitude dimensions. This observation is, of course, a subjective one but one well worth checking in future research.

When correlations were computed on the basis of parent group means, it was discovered that counselor perceptions of a high level of interaction were related to a higher level of parent perception of negative results and less parent willingness to recommend participation in the groups. It was also found that counselor perceptions of a high level of interaction were related to a higher level of parent perception of changed behavior on the part of their children. This finding suggests that "liking" the group experience and getting some benefit from it may not be necessarily related. This is a concern which this investigation has had from the outset.

The number of significant correlations increased when individual means rather than group means were utilized. This was attributed to the higher N available for the latter correlations. The outcomes here were generally similar to those obtained for group means, with some additions.

Attendance Variables

Attendance following Meeting 1 of Series 1 (a data collection session) declined precipitously. Half of the number of parents who attended Meeting 1 of Series 1 attended Meeting 5, the last session of the first series. There was no such decline during Series 2. Participation in the second series was high throughout. It would appear that breaking the group sessions into separate series had the effect of providing an exit point for those who had had enough and new commitment to the group for those who continued.

Continued parent participation in the group was marked by their responding either more favorably or in a more highly differentiated way to the group counseling experience. Following Series 2, those who attended more sessions tended to be somewhat more ambivalent about their experience in group counseling than those who attended fewer sessions, although the general response was highly positive. This finding may be further indication that those parents who attended longest and most faithfully were those who felt they had more serious problems. The correlation between parent perceptions of the helpfulness of group discussion and parent perception of whether behavior changes in children were for the better or the worse were significantly correlated with total number of meetings attended or attendance at meetings later in the series. It appears reasonable to say that longer parent participation or participation later in the series is related to more favorable parent response, although this relationship is not linear.

A significant relationship exists between counselor perceptions of rapport, interaction and group outcome and attendance variables. The general rule appears to be that these relationships are high at a time later in the series and are never significant during Meeting No. 1. Since attendance is a behavioral measure, it might be well to study the possibility (in the future) that counselor perceptions of rapport, interaction and outcome are more valid (accurate) than their perceptions of hostility.

Generally speaking, the data reported strongly support both the feasibility and value of parent group counseling. It appears possible to involve significant numbers of parents in such an enterprise on a voluntary basis. While experience demonstrates that this is much easier to do with parents who are in the middle and upper socioeconomic ranges, it is also now clear that parents from lower socioeconomic strata and/or minority ethnic group backgrounds can, with the appropriate approach, be involved in parent group counseling.

In addition to feasibility, the present research on parent group counseling has indicated its overwhelming positive acceptance by both those who participate and those who provide the counseling service. The similarity of perception between these two groups is striking. The present data, although based entirely on the subjective reports of participants and counselors, provides some reason to anticipate that the analysis of future data will reveal behavior changes among the children of those who participated. Parents report such changes in numbers which are surprising when the relative briefness of parent counseling sessions is taken into account. There is also a suggestion that parent counseling groups were not as helpful to parents who have serious problems as to those experiencing less serious or normal problems with their children.

One final point has been demonstrated. A wide spectrum of professionals representing different areas of pupil personnel services were utilized in the parent counseling endeavor. Included were counselors, social workers, psychologists, speech therapists and nurses. Although all were provided with brief training, the present data provide no reason for suspecting that differential performance was obtained from any particular professional group. The authors attribute this to the self selection of participating counselors. Under such conditions, there seems to be no reason to assume that the professional skills required to do adequate parent group counseling are the special property of any of the pupil personnel professions.

References

Shaw, M. C. and Rector, W. H. Parent and counselor perceptions of their participation in group counseling. Monograph #3, Chico State College (mimeographed, 38 pp. + appendices), October 1966.

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. A proposed model and research design for pupil personnel services in the public school. Monograph #1, University of California at Los Angeles (mimeographed, 95 pp. + appendices), March 1964.

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. Guidance research in action: group counseling with parents. Monograph #2, University of California at Los Angeles (mimeographed, 200 pp. + appendices), April 1965.

APPENDICES

A TO C

APPENDIX A

Parent____________________
School____________________
Consultant__________________

Group No._______________
Series No._______________

POST-SERIES REACTION SHEET
(Parent)
GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California at Los Angeles

For several weeks you have been participating in group discussions. We would like to know your reactions to this experience in order to plan for the future. Will you please respond frankly to the attached rating scale so that the reactions of all participants may be objectively evaluated. Should you run out of space, please feel free to continue on the back of this sheet or use additional paper.

1. Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

   Not at all* * * * *Very much so
   1 2 3 4 5

   1a. If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, please explain briefly in what ways the discussions have been helpful.

2. Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

   Not at all* * * * *Very much so
   ~~1~~ ~~2~~ ~~3~~ ~~4~~ ~~5~~
   5 4 3 2 1

   2a. If you checked 3, 2 or 1 above, please explain briefly what negative results occurred.

3. Have there been any recent changes in your child's behavior around home and other out-of-school situations?

Not at all*____________*____________*____________*____________*Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

3a. If you checked 3, 4 or 5 above, have these changes been for the
better_____
worse______ Please explain briefly the nature of these changes.

4. Would you recommend participation in a similar group to friends who have children with academic problems? yes_____
no______

5. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be least helpful (or possibly harmful)?

6. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be most helpful?

7. Please write here and on the back any feelings or reactions about your experience in this group which you have not had an opportunity to express above.

APPENDIX B

IMPORTANT! One of these forms is to be completed for each group at the conclusion of each series.

NOTE. When used for teacher group, observe substitutions in parentheses above text.

Consultant____________________
District____________________
School____________________
Group Number________ Parent ☐ Teacher ☐
(Circle) Series: 1 2 3
Date This Series Started:________

COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUP

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. How would you describe rapport in this group?

(Circle one)	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

(teachers)

2. How much interaction was there among parents in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3. How much hostility was expressed in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

4. (Answer only if answer to above question was 3, 4 or 5.) Was this hostility directed primarily towards

			(Parents)	(Own Pupils)	
(Circle one)	Self	Counselor	Teacher(s)	Own Child	Other Group Members
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

5. Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

6. What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

(Circle one)	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

7. In a short paragraph, characterize this group and put down your reactions to it. (Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.)

APPENDIX C

Consultant____________________
District____________________
Level: Elem. Jr.Hi. Sr.Hi.
(Circle One)

GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Would you recommend working with parent groups as an effective technique to other counselors?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

2. Would you like to see a program of parent group counseling introduced in your own guidance system (assuming appropriate shifts in load)?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3. Do you feel that your work with parent groups had any impact on their children?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Probably No	Uncertain	Probably Yes	Definitely Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3a. If "yes" (4 or 5), please describe some of the kinds of outcomes you believe occurred.

4. In a paragraph or two, please summarize your major reactions to your group counseling experience this year. Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.